

# On Sharp Thresholds of Monotone Properties: Bourgain's Proof Revisited.

Deepak Bal\*

Department of Mathematical Sciences,  
Carnegie Mellon University,  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213.

## Abstract

The purpose of this expository note is to give the proof of a theorem of Bourgain with some additional details and updated notation. The theorem first appeared as an appendix to the breakthrough paper by Friedgut, *Sharp Thresholds of graph properties and the  $k$ -SAT Problem* [2]. Throughout, we use notation and definitions akin to those in O'Donnell's book, *Analysis of Boolean Functions* [5].

## 1 Background and Theorem

Random structures often exhibit what is called a threshold phenomenon. That is, a relatively small change in a parameter can cause a swift change in the structure of the overall system. In the random graph  $G(n, p)$ , the probability space consisting of  $n$  vertices and edge probability  $p$ , this phenomenon is a central object of study. In his 1999 paper, *Sharp Thresholds of graph properties and the  $k$ -SAT Problem*, Friedgut gave a simple characterization of monotone graph properties with coarse thresholds. The result is important because unlike results which preceded, it holds when  $p = p(n) \rightarrow 0$  like  $n^{-\Theta(1)}$  which is a range in which many thresholds occur. In the appendix to that paper, Bourgain gave a characterization of general monotone properties (as opposed to graph properties) which exhibit coarse thresholds. In this note, we explain the proof of this result with more details.

Let  $(\Omega, \pi)$  be a finite probability space and for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $(\Omega^n, \pi^{\otimes n})$  be the  $n$  dimensional product probability space. We will write  $x \sim \pi^{\otimes n}$  to indicate

---

\*dbal@cmu.edu

that  $x$  is drawn from  $\Omega^n$  according to  $\pi^{\otimes n}$ . Bourgain's result concerns the particular product space  $(\{0, 1\}^n, \mu_p^{\otimes n})$  where  $\mu_p$  is the  $p$ -biased distribution on  $\{0, 1\}$ . So  $\mu_p(1) = p$ ,  $\mu_p(0) = q := 1 - p$ . We will use the notation  $\{0, 1\}_p^n$  for  $(\{0, 1\}^n, \mu_p^{\otimes n})$ .

Throughout, unless otherwise specified, we will write  $\mathbb{P}[\cdot]$  for  $\mathbb{P}_{x \sim \pi^{\otimes n}}[\cdot]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  for  $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \pi^{\otimes n}}[\cdot]$ . If we are in the context of  $\{0, 1\}_p^n$ , then the probability and expectations will be with respect to  $\mu_p^{\otimes n}$ .

In this note, we will consider  $f : \Omega^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ . This will simplify some calculations from Bourgain's proof where the range is taken to be  $\{0, 1\}$ . We say  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$  is monotone (increasing) if  $f(x) \leq f(y)$  whenever  $x \leq y$  component-wise. For any subset  $S \subseteq [n]$ , we write  $x_S$  to refer to the coordinates of  $x$  from  $S$ . In an abuse of notation, sometimes this will refer to a vector of length  $|S|$  and sometimes we will want  $x_S$  to be a vector of length  $n$ . Also, for  $S \subseteq [n]$ , we write  $\mathbb{1}_S$  for the vector of length  $n$  with 1s in the positions corresponding to  $S$  and 0s elsewhere.

Let  $f : \Omega^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ . The  $i$ th expectation operator,  $E_i$ , applied to  $f$  takes the expectation with respect to variable  $x_i$ . So

$$E_i f(x) = \mathbb{E}_{x_i \sim \pi} [f(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)]$$

is a function of  $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n$ . We also define the  $i$ th directional Laplacian operator,  $L_i$ , by

$$L_i f = f - E_i f.$$

The influence of coordinate  $i$  on  $f$  is defined as

$$\mathbf{Inf}_i[f] = \langle f, L_i f \rangle = \langle L_i f, L_i f \rangle$$

where the inner product is defined by

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \pi^{\otimes n}} [f(x)g(x)].$$

The total influence of  $f$  is  $\mathbb{I}[f] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Inf}_i[f]$ .

Let  $f = \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} f^S$  be the generalized Walsh expansion or orthogonal decomposition of  $f$ . Recall, that the orthogonal decomposition of  $f$  is the unique decomposition that satisfies the following two properties

1. For every  $S \subseteq [n]$ ,  $f^S(x) = f^S(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  depends only on  $x_i$  for which  $i \in S$ .
2. For every  $S \subseteq [n]$ ,  $E_i f^S(x) = 0$  for all  $i \in S$ .

In the case of  $\{0, 1\}_p^n$ , for any  $S \subseteq [n]$ , we have that

$$f^{=S}(x) = \widehat{f}(S) \prod_{i \in S} r(x_i)$$

where  $r(0) = -\sqrt{\frac{p}{1-p}}$  and  $r(1) = \sqrt{\frac{1-p}{p}}$ . We also have that  $\widehat{f}(S) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mu_p^{\otimes n}} [f(x) \prod_{i \in S} r(x_i)]$ .

If  $S \subseteq [n]$  and  $\bar{S} = [n] \setminus S$ , we let  $f^{\subseteq S}$  represent the function dependent on the coordinates of  $S$  where we take the expectation of  $f$  over the variables in  $\bar{S}$ . So if we think of  $x$  as  $(x_S, x_{\bar{S}})$ , then

$$f^{\subseteq S}(x) = f^{\subseteq S}(x_S) = \mathbb{E}_{x_{\bar{S}} \sim \pi^{\otimes \bar{S}}} [f(x_S, x_{\bar{S}})].$$

$f^{=S}$  and  $f^{\subseteq S}$  are related by the following two formulas:

$$f^{=S} = \sum_{J \subseteq S} (-1)^{|S|-|J|} f^{\subseteq J} \quad (1.1)$$

and

$$f^{\subseteq S} = \sum_{J \subseteq S} f^{=J} \quad (1.2)$$

Basic Fourier formulas, which hold for the orthogonal decomposition, give us that

$$L_i f = \sum_{S \ni i} f^{=S}, \quad \mathbf{Inf}_i[f] = \sum_{S \ni i} \|f^{=S}\|_2^2 = \sum_{S \ni i} \widehat{f}(S)^2 \quad (1.3)$$

and

$$\mathbb{I}[f] = \sum_{i=1}^n \|L_i f\|_2^2 = \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} |S| \|f^{=S}\|_2^2 \quad (1.4)$$

where the last equality in (1.3) holds in the case of  $\{0, 1\}_p^n$ .

For products of general finite probability spaces, we have the following result

**Theorem 1.** *For any  $f : \Omega^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$  with  $\mathbb{E}[f(x)] = 0$  and  $\mathbb{I}[f] < C$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{0 < |S| \leq 10C} |f^{\subseteq S}(x)| \right] > \delta \quad (1.5)$$

where  $\delta = 2^{-O(C^2)}$ .

This result is the main ingredient in Bourgain's proof and it does not rely on the space being  $p$ -biased bits, so we will prove it here without such an assumption.

For a monotone boolean function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ , Margulis [4] and Russo [6] proved the following relationship between the total influence and the sharpness of the threshold:

$$p(1-p) \frac{d}{dp} \mathbb{P}[f(x) = 1] = \mathbb{I}[f] \quad (1.6)$$

where  $\mathbb{P}$  and  $\mathbb{I}$  are both with respect to  $\mu_p^{\otimes n}$ . In other words, the rate of transition of  $f$  from  $-1$  to  $1$  with respect to the rate of increase of  $p$  is determined by the total influence. Hence functions with large total influence should have "sharp" thresholds and functions with small total influence should have "coarse" thresholds.

Bourgain's result in [2] is now given. This result basically states the following. Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$  be a monotone boolean function and let  $p$  be the critical probability (which is allowed to approach 0 rapidly with  $n$ ), when  $f$  is equally likely to be  $-1$  or  $1$ . Then if  $f$ 's total influence is bounded, either (1) a non-negligible portion (according to  $\mu_p^{\otimes n}$ ) of the  $x$ 's with  $f(x) = 1$  have a small witness, or (2) there exists a small set of coordinates such that conditioning on these coordinates being 1 boosts the expected value of  $f$  by a non-negligible amount. Keep in mind that in the following statement,  $\mathbb{E}, \mathbb{P}$  and  $\mathbb{I}$  are with respect to  $\mu_p^{\otimes n}$ .

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$  be monotone (increasing) and suppose that  $p = p(n)$  is such that  $\mathbb{E}[f] = 0$  and  $\mathbb{I}[f] < C$ . Then there exists some  $\delta' = 2^{-O(C^2)}$  such that if  $p < \frac{\delta'}{20C}$  then at least one of the following two possibilities holds:*

1.

$$\mathbb{P}[\exists S \subset [n], |S| \leq 10C, \mathbb{1}_S \leq x, f(\mathbb{1}_S) = 1] > \delta'. \quad (1.7)$$

2. *There exists  $S' \subseteq [n]$  with  $|S'| \leq 10C$  with  $f(\mathbb{1}_{S'}) = 0$  such that*

$$f^{\subseteq S'}(\mathbb{1}_{S'}) > \delta'. \quad (1.8)$$

*Proof of Corollary 1.* Let  $\delta' = \delta/2$  where  $\delta$  is given by Theorem 1. Suppose that the first alternative of the theorem, (1.7), does not hold, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}[\exists S \subset [n], |S| \leq 10C, \mathbb{1}_S \leq x, f(\mathbb{1}_S) = 1] \leq \delta'. \quad (1.9)$$

Then applying Theorem 1, if  $n$  is sufficiently large, there must exist  $\bar{x} \in \{0, 1\}^n$  and  $S \subseteq [n]$ ,  $|S| \leq 10C$  such that for all  $x' \leq \bar{x}$  with at most  $10C$  1's, we have  $f(x') = 0$  and

$$|f^{\subseteq S}(\bar{x})| > \delta'. \quad (1.10)$$

Now by monotonicity of  $f$ , we have for all  $S, x_S$

$$\begin{aligned} f^{\subseteq S}(x_S) &= \mathbb{E}_{x_{\bar{S}} \sim \mu_p^{\bar{S}}} [f(x_S, x_{\bar{S}})] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{x_{\bar{S}} \sim \mu_p^{\bar{S}}} [f(\vec{0}_S, x_{\bar{S}})] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} \left[ f(x) - \sum_{i \in S} \mathbb{1}_{\{x_i=1\}} \right] \\ &= -p|S| > \frac{\delta'}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

So (1.10) implies that

$$f^{\subseteq S}(\bar{x}) > \delta'$$

which implies the second alternative of the theorem, (1.8), by taking

$$S' = S \cap \{i : \bar{x}_i = 1\}.$$

□

The following easy corollary may be a useful statement.

**Corollary 2.** *Let  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$  be monotone (increasing) and suppose that  $p = p(n) < \frac{\delta}{100C}$  is such that  $\mathbb{E}[f] = 0$  where  $\delta = 2^{-O(C^2)}$ . Furthermore, suppose that  $\mathbb{I}[f] < C$ . Then there exists a subset  $S \subseteq [n]$  with  $|S| \leq 10C$  such that*

$$\mathbb{E}[f(x) \mid x_S = (1, \dots, 1)] > \delta. \quad (1.11)$$

To derive this from Corollary 1, note that if the first alternative holds, then there exists a small  $S$  which makes the expectation in (1.11) equal to 1. If the second alternative holds, note that (1.8) and (1.11) are equivalent.

As a corollary of his very general theorem, Hatami [3] proves that in fact the expectation in (1.11) can be made arbitrarily close to 1. The size of the guaranteed  $S$  may have size exponential in  $C^2$ , but it is still independent of  $n$ .

## 2 The Proof

*Proof of Theorem 1.* First observe that the facts  $\|f^{\emptyset}\|_2^2 = 0$  and  $\sum_{S \subseteq [n]} \|f^S\|_2^2 = 1$  and the assumption that  $\sum_{S \subseteq [n]} |S| \|f^S\|_2^2 < C$  imply that

$$\frac{9}{10} \leq \sum_{0 < |S| \leq 10C} \|f^S\|_2^2 \quad (2.1)$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{|S| > 10C} \|f^S\|_2^2 &\leq \sum_{S \subseteq [n]} \frac{|S|}{10C} \|f^S\|_2^2 \\ &< \frac{C}{10C} = 1/10. \end{aligned}$$

Now, consider the following functions

$$h_i(x) := \left( \sum_{\substack{S \ni i \\ |S| \leq 10C}} |f^S(x)|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

and

$$h(x) = \left( \sum_{|S| \leq 10C} |f^S(x)|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

By Prop. 6 of [1], we may say that for a fixed  $1 < q \leq 2$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_i(x)\|_q^q &\leq c_1 \|L_i f\|_q^q \\ &= c_1 \mathbb{E} [|L_i f|^q] \\ &\leq c_2 \mathbb{E} [|L_i f|] \\ &\leq C_1 \mathbb{E} [(L_i f)^2] \\ &= C_1 \mathbf{Inf}_i[f]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

with  $C_1 = C_1(q) = 2^{O(C)}$  and  $c_1, c_2$  are some constants which also depend only on  $q$ . The reader should note that in the proof that follows, we will only apply the result of [1] with  $q = 4/3$ . If  $q' = \frac{q}{q-1}$ , then we also have

$$\|h(x)\|_{q'} \leq C_1 \|f\|_{q'} = C_1. \quad (2.3)$$

Hence we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \|h_i(x)\|_q^q \leq C_1 \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Inf}_i[f] \leq C \cdot C_1. \quad (2.4)$$

Let  $0 < \varepsilon < M < \infty$  be constants which are taken to be  $\varepsilon = 2^{-O(C)}$  and  $M = O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)$  and let

$$\eta_i(x) = \mathbb{1}_{\{h_i(x) > \varepsilon\}} \quad (2.5)$$

$$\xi(x) = \mathbb{1}_{\{\sum_i \eta_i(x) < M\}}. \quad (2.6)$$

Specific values for  $M$  and  $\varepsilon$  may be determined in terms of  $C$  and  $C_1$  by analyzing the inequalities that follow.

Now  $1 - \xi(x)$  is the indicator of the event that there are more than  $M$  coordinates  $i$ , such that  $h_i(x) > \varepsilon$ . Given relation (1.4) and the assumption that total influence is bounded, we should expect this event to have small probability. Hence we have, using Markov's theorem twice, that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[1 - \xi(x)] &\leq \frac{1}{M} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i(x) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M\varepsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(x)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{M\varepsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{S \ni i} f^{=S}(x)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \frac{C}{M\varepsilon^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, inequality (2.1) tells us that

$$\frac{9}{10} < \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{0 < |S| \leq 10C} f^{=S}(x)^2 \right].$$

Note that for any  $x$ , either there exist  $\geq M$  many  $i$  such that  $h_i(x) > \varepsilon$ , or there are  $< M$  such  $i$ . In the latter case, there are two types of  $S \subseteq [n]$  with  $0 < |S| \leq 10C$ : those which contain an  $i$  such that  $h_i(x) \leq \varepsilon$  and those containing only  $i$ 's such that  $h_i(x) > \varepsilon$ .

Hence, using the indicator functions  $\xi, \eta_i$ , and recalling the definitions of  $h(x)$  and  $h_i(x)$ , we may split up the following expectation as

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{0 < |S| \leq 10C} f^S(x)^2 \right] \leq \mathbb{E} [h(x)^2(1 - \xi(x))] \quad (2.7)$$

$$+ \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(x)^2(1 - \eta_i(x)) \right] \quad (2.8)$$

$$+ \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{0 < |S| \leq 10C} f^S(x)^2 \left( \prod_{i \in S} \eta_i(x) \right) \xi(x) \right]. \quad (2.9)$$

We now bound each of these terms in turn.

For (2.7), we apply Cauchy-Schwarz and see that

$$\mathbb{E} [h(x)^2(1 - \xi(x))] \leq \mathbb{E} [h(x)^4]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} [(1 - \xi(x))^2]^{1/2} \quad (2.10)$$

$$\leq \|h(x)\|_4^2 \mathbb{E} [1 - \xi(x)]^{1/2} \quad (2.11)$$

$$\leq C_1^2 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{C}{M\varepsilon^2}} \quad (2.12)$$

where we used (2.3) with  $q' = 4$  (and hence  $q = 4/3$ ) to go from (2.11) to (2.12).

For (2.8), we note that in this expectation,  $h_i(x) \leq \varepsilon$  for any  $x$  such that  $\eta_i(x) = 0$ . Also, since each  $h_i$  is a positive function, we may write  $h_i^2 = h_i^{2/3} h_i^{4/3}$ . So

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n h_i(x)^2(1 - \eta_i(x)) \right] &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} [h_i(x)^{2/3} h_i(x)^{4/3}(1 - \eta_i(x))] \\ &\leq \varepsilon^{2/3} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} [h_i(x)^{4/3}] \\ &= \varepsilon^{2/3} \sum_{i=1}^n \|h_i(x)\|_{4/3}^{4/3} \\ &\leq \varepsilon^{2/3} \cdot C \cdot C_1 \end{aligned}$$

where we used (2.4) with  $q = 4/3$  to get the last line.

Finally, for (2.9), we first observe that for any  $x$ , we have that

$$\sum_{0 < |S| \leq 10C} \left( \prod_{i \in S} \eta_i(x) \right) \xi(x) < M^{10C}$$

since if  $\xi(x) = 1$ , then  $\mathcal{M}_x = \{i : \eta_i(x) = 1\}$  has  $|\mathcal{M}_x| < M$ . So the non-zero terms in the sum correspond to  $S \subseteq \mathcal{M}_x$ ,  $0 < |S| \leq 10C$ . So we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{0 < |S| \leq 10C} f^{=S}(x)^2 \left( \prod_{i \in S} \eta_i(x) \right) \xi(x) \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{0 < |S| \leq 10C} f^{=S}(x)^2 \sum_{0 < |S| \leq 10C} \left( \prod_{i \in S} \eta_i(x) \right) \xi(x) \right] \\ & \leq M^{10C} \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{0 < |S| \leq 10C} f^{=S}(x)^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Adding these three estimates gives

$$\frac{9}{10} < C_1^2 \sqrt{\frac{C}{M\varepsilon^2}} + \varepsilon^{2/3} C C_1 + M^{10C} \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{0 < |S| \leq 10C} f^{=S}(x)^2 \right]. \quad (2.13)$$

Now, by taking  $\varepsilon = 2^{-O(C)}$  and  $M = O(1/\varepsilon)$ , we easily have that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{0 < |S| \leq 10C} f^{=S}(x)^2 \right] > 2^{-O(C^2)}.$$

Now note that for any  $S \subseteq [n]$ , by (1.1),

$$\begin{aligned} |f^{=S}| &= \left| \sum_{J \subseteq S} (-1)^{|S|-|J|} f^{\subseteq J} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{J \subseteq S} |f^{\subseteq J}| \leq 2^{|S|} \max_{J \subseteq S} \{|f^{\subseteq J}|\} \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

$$\leq 2^{|S|}. \quad (2.15)$$

since  $|f^{\subseteq S}| \leq 1$ . So applying (2.14) and (2.15) and using the fact that

$f^{\subseteq \emptyset} = \mathbb{E}[f] = 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
2^{-O(C^2)} &< \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{0 < |S| \leq 10C} f^{\subseteq S}(x)^2 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{0 < |S| \leq 10C} |f^{\subseteq S}(x)| |f^{\subseteq S}(x)| \right] \\
&\leq 2^{10C} \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{0 < |S| \leq 10C} |f^{\subseteq S}(x)| \right] \\
&\leq 2^{20C} \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{0 < |S| \leq 10C} \max_{J \subseteq S} |f^{\subseteq J}(x)| \right] \\
&= 2^{20C} \mathbb{E} \left[ \max_{0 < |S| \leq 10C} |f^{\subseteq S}(x)| \right]
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. □

## References

- [1] J. Bourgain, “Walsh subspaces of  $L^p$ -product spaces.” Séminaire Analyse fonctionnelle (dit ”Maurey-Schwartz”) (1979-1980): 1-14. <http://eudml.org/doc/109239>.
- [2] E. Friedgut, J. Bourgain, “Sharp Thresholds of Graph Properties, and the  $k$ -SAT Problem.” Journal of the American Mathematical Society (1999): Vol. 12, No. 4, 1017-1054.
- [3] H. Hatami, “A structure theorem for Boolean functions with small total influences.” Annals of Mathematics, to appear.
- [4] G. A. Margulis, “Probabilistic characteristics of graphs with large connectivity.” Problemy Perdaci Informacii (1974): Vol. 10, No. 2, 101-108.
- [5] R. O’Donnell, “Analysis of Boolean Functions.” <http://www.analysisofbooleanfunctions.org>
- [6] L. Russo, “An approximate zero-one law.” Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gabiete (1981): Vol. 61, No. 1, 129-139.